

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being fully anticipated by a print-out titled "Way Back Machine" (Collins) from a Web site, and Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Collins in view of Official Notice. Claim 19 was further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement, and the Examiner also objected to the drawings as not showing every claimed feature.

Applicants herein ask that independent Claims 1, 7 and 13 be amended to better define the subject matters of these claims, and Claim 19 is being amended to delete language to which the Examiner objected. The objection to the drawings is respectfully traversed.

For the reasons discussed below, the drawings show all of the claimed features, Claim 19 is fully enabled by the specification, and all of Claims 1-19 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. The Examiner is, accordingly, asked to reconsider and to withdraw the objection to the drawings, the rejection of Claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. 102, and the rejections of Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103 and 112, and to allow Claims 1-19.

In objecting to the drawings, the Examiner argued that the drawings do not show the feature, which is described in Claims 1, 7 and 13, of providing the user with access to the database, whereby said access provides the user with a virtual office to enter a variety of transactions using data elements in the database. This feature, however, is shown in Figure 2. More specifically, Figure 2 illustrates a database, and several users or potential users that are provided access to that database. These users and potential users include a customer, a franchisee, a franchisee technician, and the p8blic. Figure 2 also identifies a number of

transactions including selling maintenance contract, call management, warranty management, and accounts receivable and accounts payable. Figure 2 thus provides the appropriate showing of the above-identified feature of Claims 1, 7 and 13, and the Examiner is respectfully asked to reconsider and to withdraw the objection to the drawing.

The Examiner rejected Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. 112 on the grounds that the specification does not have support for the feature that access to the database provides the user with a view of recommended solutions related to a problem. To address this rejection, Applicants are herein deleting this language from Claim 19. It is believed that this obviates the rejection of Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. 112, and the Examiner is also asked to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. 112.

With respect to the rejection of the claims over the prior art, Applicant submits that Claims 1-19 patentably distinguish over the prior art because that prior art does not disclose or teach the complete, Web based solution to provide after sales service data, as described in independent Claims 1, 7 and 13.

To elaborate, the present invention relates to methods and systems for providing service data. The invention may be effectively used to provide a complete solution that addresses all of the needs of the service after sales. In order to achieve this complete solution, a stream of information flows to and from a database, between a service provider and an equipment manufacturer, integrating back office and front office operations, and allowing total management over customer service.

Among other advantages, this helps that manufacturer to increase service revenue, to capture better customer and equipment history, to improve turn around time, to increase profitability, management of spare parts, warranty administration and customer satisfaction. An important aspect of the invention is that all the necessary data are made available to the service providers over the Internet. Collins does not show or suggest his aspect of the present invention.

More specifically, the Collins document is, as the Examiner has observed, a Web page from a Web site. This Web site, however, does not provide all the necessary information. Instead, as the print out clearly states, a service provider needs to make a telephone call to obtain much important information. As may be appreciated, a telephone call does not provide the service provider with the same ease of access to a high volume of data that can be readily obtained from a database via the Internet.

Applicant herein asks that independent Claims 1, 7 and 13 be amended to emphasize this difference between the present invention and the prior art. In particular, the preambles of Claim 1 and 7 are being amended to indicate that these claims are directed, respectively, to a method and system for providing a complete set of after sales service data over the Internet to an authorized user. Similarly, the preamble of Claim 13 is being amended to indicate that the method steps described in the claim are for the purpose of providing a complete set of after sales service data over the Internet to an authorized user. Claims 1, 7 and 13 are also being amended to describe the database as having that complete set of service data, to indicate that the user is provided access to the database over the Internet, and that the user, if authorized, is given access to that database in a secure manner.

This feature of the present invention is of utility for a number of reasons. For instance, as mentioned above, it gives a service provider a complete, Web based solution that addresses all of the needs of the service after sales. In addition, this invention may be used to give a service provider with enterprise wide visibility to a continuous stream of data and information.

The other references of record have been reviewed, and these other references, whether they are considered individually or in combination. Also do not disclose or suggest the above-discussed aspect of the instant invention.

In view of the above-discussed differences between Claims 1, 7 and 13 and the prior art, and because of the advantages associated with those differences, these claims patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. Claims 2-6 and 19 are dependent from, and are allowable with, Claim 1; and Claims 8-12 are dependent from Claim 7 and are allowable therewith. Also, Claims 14-18 are dependent from, and are allowable with, Claim 13.

The changes requested herein to the claims only elaborate on features already described in the claims. For example, the claims presently describe a database, and providing a user with access to that database, and this Amendment describes more expressly contents of that database, and how the user access is achieved. It is thus believed that entry of this Amendment is within the discretion of the Examiner, and such entry is respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, the Examiner is asked to enter this Amendment, and to reconsider and to withdraw the objection to the drawings. The Examiner is also respectfully asked to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. 102, and the rejections of Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103 and 112, and to allow Claims 1-19. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's Attorneys, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

*John S. Sensny*  
John S. Sensny  
Registration No. 28,757  
Attorney for Applicant

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser  
400 Garden City Plaza - Suite 300  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343

JSS:jy